REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated July 6, 2007. By this communication, claim 1 is amended. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 1 can be found, for example, at lines 19-25 on page 9 of the disclosure. Claims 1-6 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Duboc, Jr. et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,541,473) in view of Applicants' so-called admitted prior art (AAPA). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants disclose an exemplary Field Emission Display having a mesh grid interposed between a cathode plate and an anode plate. The mesh grid is a metal plate that tightly contacts the cathode plate due to spacers.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other elements, a mesh grid having an electron control hole corresponding to a gate hole and an insulation layer formed on a surface of the mesh grid that faces the cathode plate, wherein the mesh grid is a plate.

Duboc, Jr. fails to render Applicants' claims obvious because it discloses that a grid 210 is formed by laminating alternating layers of ceramic material and insulating material. Duboc, Jr. states that the laminated structure is advantageous for achieving registration between the grid and an emitter tip (see col. 11, lines 12-16). Duboc's reliance on the laminated grid structure to achieve its purported advantages is effectively a teaching away from the use of a metal plate as recited in

Attorney's Docket No. 1030681-000613 Application No. 10/743,791

Page 5

Applicants' claims. The Patent Office previously relied on Applicants' alleged prior

art admission to remedy acknowledged deficiencies of Duboc, Jr., but even when

considering these alleged admissions, the hypothetical combination still does not

remedy the deficiencies of Duboc, Jr. with respect to the claimed mesh grid. For

these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Based on at least the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit

that claims 1-6 are allowable, and this application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants request a favorable examination and consideration of the

instant application. In the event the instant application can be placed in even better

form, Applicants request that the undersigned attorney be contacted at the number

below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 18, 2007

Registration No. 51,522

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404

(703) 836-6620